arXiv:1511.04853v2 [math.CO] 25 Jan 2016

Vertex-weighted Graphs and Freeness of ψ-graphical Arrangements

Daisuke Suyama[*], Shuhei Tsujie[†]

Abstract

Let G be a simple graph of ℓ vertices $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ with edge set E_G. The graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_G$ consists of hyperplanes $\{x_i - x_j = 0\}$, where $\{i, j\} \in E_G$. It is well known that three properties, chordality of G, supersolvability of $\mathcal{A}_G$, and freeness of $\mathcal{A}_G$ are equivalent. Recently, Richard P. Stanley introduced ψ-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ as a generalization of graphical arrangements. Lili Mu and Stanley characterized the supersolvability of the ψ-graphical arrangements and conjectured that the freeness and the supersolvability of ψ-graphical arrangements are equivalent. In this paper, we will prove the conjecture.

Keywords: Hyperplane arrangement, Graphical arrangement, Ish arrangement, Coxeter arrangement, Free arrangement, Supersolvable arrangement, Chordal graph, Vertex-weighted graph

2010 MSC: 52C35, 32S22, 05C15, 05C22, 20F55, 13N15

1 Introduction

Let E be an $(\ell + 1)$-dimensional Euclidean space and $\{z, x_1, \ldots, x_\ell\}$ a standard coordinates in the dual space E^*. A **central hyperplane arrangement** (arrangement, for short) in E is a finite set of vector subspaces of codimension 1.

[*]Office of International Affairs, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-0815, Japan. email:dsuyama@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

[†]Department of Mathematics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo, Hokkaido 060-0810, Japan. email:tsujie@math.sci.hokudai.ac.jp

Let G be a simple graph with the vertex set $V_G = \{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and the edge set E_G. Let $\psi\colon V_G \to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ be a map satisfying $|\psi(i)| < \infty$ for every vertex $i \in V_G$. The **graphical arrangement** $\mathcal{A}_G$ and the **ψ-graphical arrangement** $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{A}_G \coloneqq \{\{x_i - x_j = 0\} \mid \{i, j\} \in E_G\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi} \coloneqq \{\{z = 0\}\} &\cup \{\{x_i - x_j = 0\} \mid \{i, j\} \in E_G\} \\ &\cup \{\{x_i = az\} \mid 1 \le i \le \ell, a \in \psi(i)\},\end{aligned}$$

where $\{\alpha = 0\}\,(\alpha \in E^*)$ stands for the hyperplane $\{v \in E \mid \alpha(v) = 0\}$. When G is complete, the arrangements $\mathcal{A}_G$ are known as braid arrangements or Coxeter arrangements of type $A_{\ell-1}$. The ψ-graphical arrangements were introduced by Richard P. Stanley [11] to investigate the number of chambers of the visibility arrangements of order polytopes.

For a central arrangement $\mathcal{A}$, the **intersection lattice** $L(\mathcal{A})$ is the set of intersections of hyperplanes in $\mathcal{A}$ with the order by reverse inclusion: $X \le Y \Leftrightarrow X \supseteq Y$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is **supersolvable** if the lattice $L(\mathcal{A})$ is supersolvable as defined by Stanley [9].

Let S be the symmetric algebra of the dual space E^*. Then S can be identified with the polynomial ring $\mathbb{R}[z, x_1, \dots, x_\ell]$. Let $\mathrm{Der}(S)$ be the module of derivations of S

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Der}(S) := \{\theta : S \to S \mid \theta \text{ is } \mathbb{R}\text{-linear},& \\ \theta(fg) = f\theta(g) + \theta(f)g \text{ for any } f, g \in S\}.&\end{aligned}$$

The module of logarithmic derivations $D(\mathcal{A})$ is defined to be

$$\begin{aligned}D(\mathcal{A}) &\coloneqq \{\theta \in \mathrm{Der}(S) \mid \theta(Q(\mathcal{A})) \in Q(\mathcal{A})S\} \\ &= \{\theta \in \mathrm{Der}(S) \mid \theta(\alpha_H) \in \alpha_H S \text{ for any } H \in \mathcal{A}\},\end{aligned}$$

where $Q(\mathcal{A}) \coloneqq \prod_{H\in\mathcal{A}} \alpha_H$ is the defining polynomial of $\mathcal{A}$ and α_H is a linear form such that $\ker(\alpha_H) = H$. We say that $\mathcal{A}$ is **free** if $D(\mathcal{A})$ is a free S-module. It is well known that a supersolvable arrangement is free [5, 7]. When $\mathcal{A}$ is free, the module $D(\mathcal{A})$ has a homogeneous basis $\{\theta_0, \dots, \theta_\ell\}$. The tuple of degrees $\exp\mathcal{A} = (\deg\theta_0, \dots, \deg\theta_\ell)$ is called the **exponents** of $\mathcal{A}$.

A graph is called **chordal** if every cycle of length greater than or equal to four has a **chord**, which is an edge that is not part of the cycle but connects

two vertices of the cycle. A vertex v is called **simplicial** if the subgraph induced by v and its neighbors is complete. We say that an ordering of the vertices $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ is a **perfect elimination ordering** if each v_i is simplicial in the subgraph induced by the vertices $\{v_1, \ldots, v_i\}$.

Theorem 1.1 (Fulkerson-Gross [4, Section 7]). *Let G be a simple graph. Then G is chordal if and only if G has a perfect elimination ordering.*

These notions for graphs and properties for graphical arrangements are related by the following theorem.

Theorem 1.2 (Stanley [10, Corollary 4.10], Edelman-Reiner [3, Theorem 3.3]). *The following three conditions are equivalent:*

(1) G is chordal.

(2) $\mathcal{A}_G$ is supersolvable.

(3) $\mathcal{A}_G$ is free.

We say that a perfect elimination ordering $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ of G is a **weighted elimination ordering** if $\psi(v_i) \supseteq \psi(v_j)$ whenever $i < j$ and $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E_G$. Lili Mu and Stanley [6] characterized supersolvability of ψ-graphical arrangements and conjectured that the freeness and the supersolvability of ψ-graphical arrangements are equivalent.

Theorem 1.3 (Stanley [11, Theorem 6] Mu-Stanley [6, Theorem 1, 2]). *A ψ-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is supersolvable if and only if (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering.*

We say that a path $v_1 \cdots v_k$ in G is **unimodal** if there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\psi(v_1) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \psi(v_i) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \psi(v_k)$. Note that an edge $\{i, j\} \in E_G$ is unimodal if $\psi(i)$ and $\psi(j)$ are comparable, i.e., $\psi(i) \subseteq \psi(j)$ or $\psi(i) \supseteq \psi(j)$.

The main result in this paper is as follows:

Theorem 1.4. *For ψ-graphical arrangments $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$, the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering.

(2) $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is supersolvable.

(3) $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is free.

(4) G is chordal and does not contain the both of the following induced paths:

  (i) An edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ such that $\psi(v_1)$ and $\psi(v_2)$ are not comparable.

  (ii) A path $v_1 \cdots v_k$ with $k \geq 3$ and $\psi(v_1) \supsetneq \psi(v_2) = \cdots = \psi(v_{k-1}) \subsetneq \psi(v_k)$.

(5) G is chordal and every induced path is unimodal.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce a class of vertex-weighted graph over a poset in order to prove the equivalence (1) $\Leftrightarrow$ (4) $\Leftrightarrow$ (5) in Theorem 1.4. In Section 3, we will describe a relation between ψ-graphical arrangements and N-Ish arrangements, which are other deformation of braid arrangements. In Section 4, we will construct a basis for the logarithmic derivation module of the ψ-graphical arrangement when (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering. In Section 5, we will give the complete proof of Theorem 1.4.

2 Vertex-weighted graph over a poset

Let $G = (V_G, E_G)$ be a simple graph with ℓ vertices and P a poset. For a map $\psi\colon V_G \to P$, we say that the pair (G, ψ) is a **vertex-weighted graph over** P. If P is a singleton then the vertex-weighted graph (G, ψ) may be identified with the graph G. Note that when P is the poset of finite subsets in $\mathbb{R}$, the pair (G, ψ) defines the ψ-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ as mentioned in Section 1.

We say that an ordering $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ of the vertices in (G, ψ) is a **weighted elimination ordering** if $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$ is a perfect elimination ordering and $\psi(v_i) \supseteq \psi(v_j)$ whenever $i < j$ and $\{v_i, v_j\} \in E_G$. A path $v_1 \cdots v_k$ in (G, ψ) is said to be **unimodal** if there exists $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ such that $\psi(v_1) \leq \cdots \leq \psi(v_i) \geq \cdots \geq \psi(v_k)$.

Proposition 2.1. *A path in (G, ψ) is unimodal if and only if it does not contain the both of the following paths:*

(i) An edge $\{v_1, v_2\}$ such that $\psi(v_1)$ and $\psi(v_2)$ are not comparable.

(ii) A path $v_1 \cdots v_k$ with $k \geq 3$ and $\psi(v_1) > \psi(v_2) = \cdots = \psi(v_{k-1}) < \psi(v_k)$.

Proof. Since a path of type (i) or (ii) is not unimodal, a path containing at least either one of these paths is not unimodal. We will prove the converse. Let $v_1 \cdots v_k$ be a non-unimodal path in (G, ψ). We may assume that there is no edge satisfying (i), i.e., $\psi(v_i)$ and $\psi(v_{i+1})$ are comparable for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, k-1\}$. Since $v_1 \cdots v_k$ is not unimodal, there exists the minimum index $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, k-2\}$ satisfying $\psi(v_{i_0}) > \psi(v_{i_0+1})$ and the minimum index $i_2 \in \{i_0+2, \ldots, k\}$ satisfying $\psi(v_{i_2-1}) < \psi(v_{i_2})$. Let $i_1 \in \{i_0, \ldots, i_2-2\}$ be the maximum index satisfying $\psi(v_{i_1}) > \psi(v_{i_1+1})$. The maximality of i_1 and the minimality of i_2 imply $\psi(v_{i_1+1}) = \cdots = \psi(v_{i_2-1})$. Hence the path $v_{i_1} \cdots v_{i_2}$ satisfies (ii). □

We will prove the following theorem, which is a generalization of Theorem 1.1 and proves the equivalence (1) ⇔ (4) ⇔ (5) in Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 2.2. *Let (G, ψ) be a vertex-weighted graph. Then the following are equivalent:*

(1) (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering.

(2) G is chordal and does not contain induced paths in Proposition 2.1.

(3) G is chordal and every induced path is unimodal.

In order to prove Theorem 2.2, the following lemma is required.

Lemma 2.3 (Dirac [2, Theorem 4])**.** *Every chordal graph is complete or has at least two non-adjacent simplicial vertices.*

Proof of Theorem 2.2. The equivalence (2) ⇔ (3) is clear from Proposition 2.1. In order to prove (1) ⇒ (2), assume that (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering. Then G is chordal by Theorem 1.1. Suppose that (G, ψ) has at least either one of the paths in Proposition 2.1 as an induced path. This path has no weighted elimination ordering, which is a contradiction since every induced subgraph of (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering. Therefore G has no induced paths in Proposition 2.1.

To prove (2) ⇒ (1) suppose that G is chordal and does not contain induced paths in Proposition 2.1. Then $\psi(u)$ and $\psi(v)$ are comparable for every edge $\{u, v\} \in E_G$. We will prove that (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering by induction on ℓ. If $\ell = 1$ then the only ordering is a weighted elimination ordering. Assume that $\ell \geq 2$. It suffices to show that there exists a simplicial vertex v in G such that $\psi(v) \leq \psi(u)$ for any neighbor u of v since

$G \setminus \{v\}$ has a weighted elimination ordering by the induction hypothesis. Let S be the subgraph of G induced by the vertices

$$\{v \in V_G \mid \psi(v) \text{ is minimal in } \psi(V_G)\}$$

and S_0 a connected component of S. Note that for any vertices $u, v \in V_{S_0}$ we have that $\psi(u) = \psi(v)$ by the minimality. Let

$$N \coloneqq \{v \in V_G \setminus V_{S_0} \mid \{v, u\} \in E_G \text{ for some } u \in V_{S_0}\}.$$

Then we will prove that N is a clique of G. If N were not a clique then there are non-adjacent vertices $u, v \in N$. For any $w \in V_{S_0}$, we have that $\psi(u) > \psi(w) < \psi(v)$ by the minimality and comparability. Hence a shortest path from u to v in the induced subgraph $S_0 \cup \{u, v\}$ is a path of type (ii) in Proposition 2.1, which is a contradiction. Thus N is a clique. The induced subgraph $S_0 \cup N$ is chordal since G is chordal.

Now we will prove that there exists a vertex v of S_0 which is simplicial in $S_0 \cup N$. If $S_0 \cup N$ is complete, then every vertex of S_0 is simplicial in $S_0 \cup N$. If $S_0 \cup N$ is not complete, then by Lemma 2.3 there exist two non-adjacent vertices of $S_0 \cup N$ which are simplicial in $S_0 \cup N$. Since N is a clique, at least one of the vertices belongs to S_0. Thus in the both cases, S_0 has a vertex v which is simplicial in $S_0 \cup N$.

As every neighbor of v in G belongs to $S_0 \cup N$, v is also simplicial in G. This is a desired simplicial vertex. □

3 Relation to N-Ish arrangements

Abe and the authors [1] introduced N-Ish arrangements, which are deformation of braid arrangements, to state the sharing property of the freeness of deleted Shi arrangements and deleted Ish arrangements.

Let $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_\ell)$ be a tuple of finite subsets in $\mathbb{R}$. The tuple N is a **nest** if there exists a permutation w of $\{1, \ldots, \ell\}$ such that $N_{w(1)} \subseteq N_{w(2)} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq N_{w(\ell)}$. Define the N-Ish arrangement $\mathcal{I}_N$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_N \coloneqq \{\{z = 0\}\} \cup \{\{x_i - x_j = 0\} \mid 1 \le i < j \le \ell\} \\ \cup \{\{x_0 - x_i = az\} \mid 1 \le i \le \ell,\, a \in N_i\},\end{aligned}$$

where $z, x_0, \ldots, x_\ell$ are coordinates of an $(\ell+2)$-dimensional Euclidean space.

Theorem 3.1 ([1, Theorem 1.3])**.** *The following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) N is a nest.

(2) $\mathcal{I}_N$ is supersolvable.

(3) $\mathcal{I}_N$ is free.

Proposition 3.2. *Let G be the complete graph with ℓ vertices $\{1, \dots, \ell\}$ and $N = (N_1, \dots, N_\ell)$ a tuple as above. Define a map $\psi\colon V_G \to 2^{\mathbb{R}}$ by $\psi(i) = N_i$ for every $i \in V_G$. Then $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ and $\mathcal{I}_N \times \varnothing_1$ are affinely equivalent, where $\varnothing_1$ denotes the 1-dimensional empty arrangement.*

Proof. A change of coordinates $x_i \mapsto x_0 - x_i\,(1 \leq i \leq \ell), x_0 \mapsto x_0, z \mapsto z$ induces the equivalence. □

Mu and Stanley stated the following lemma without proof.

Lemma 3.3 (Mu-Stanley [6, Theorem 3])**.** *If a ψ-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is free then $\psi(i) \subseteq \psi(j)$ or $\psi(i) \supseteq \psi(j)$ for all $\{i, j\} \in E_G$.*

In the rest of this section, we will give a proof of Lemma 3.3 with the characterization of the freeness of N-Ish arrangements.

A subarrangement $\mathcal{B}$ of an arrangement $\mathcal{A}$ is called a **localization** if

$$\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}_X \coloneqq \{H \in \mathcal{A} \mid H \supseteq X\}$$

for some $X \in L(\mathcal{A})$. It is well known that every localization of a free arrangement is also free (see, for example, [7, Theorem 4.37]).

Proposition 3.4. *For a ψ-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$, let $S = (V_S, E_S)$ be an induced subgraph of G and ψ_S the restriction of ψ to V_S. Then the ψ_S-graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$ and the graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_S$ are localizations of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$.*

Proof. First we will prove that $\mathcal{A}_{S.\psi_S}$ is a localization of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$. Let $X \coloneqq \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}} H \in L(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$. We will show that $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S} = \mathcal{A}_X$. The inclusion $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_X$ is trivial. We will show the converse $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S} \supseteq \mathcal{A}_X$. Take the vector $v \in X$ such that

$$z(v) = 0, \quad x_i(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in V_S. \\ i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Every hyperplane in $\mathcal{A}_X$ must contain the vector v. The arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ consists of hyperplanes of three types, $\{z=0\}, \{x_i - x_j = 0\}$ and $\{x_i = az\}$. The hyperplane $\{z=0\}$ is in the both of $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$ and $\mathcal{A}_X$. If $\{x_i - x_j = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_X$ then $x_i(v) = x_j(v) = 0$. Hence $i, j \in V_S$ and $\{i,j\} \in E_S$ since S is an induced graph of G. Therefore $\{x_i - x_j = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$. If $\{x_i = az\} \in \mathcal{A}_X$ then $x_i(v) = az(v) = 0$. Therefore $i \in V_S$ and $\{x_i = az\} \in \mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S} \supseteq \mathcal{A}_X$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$ is a localization of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$.

To verify that $\mathcal{A}_S$ is a localization, take the vector $v \in X \coloneqq \bigcap_{H \in \mathcal{A}_S} \in L(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$ satisfying

$$z(v) = -1, \quad x_i(v) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i \in V_S. \\ i & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By the similar argument we have $\mathcal{A}_S = \mathcal{A}_X$. Hence $\mathcal{A}_S$ is a localization. □

Proof of Lemma 3.3. Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is free and $\{i,j\} \in E_G$. Let S be the subgraph induced by vertices $\{i,j\}$. By Proposition 3.4, $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$ is a localization of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ hence free. By Proposition 3.2, the arrangement $\mathcal{A}_{S,\psi_S}$ is affinely equivalent to the N-Ish arrangement $\mathcal{I}_N$, where $N = (\psi(i), \psi(j))$. Theorem 3.1 asserts that N is a nest. Therefore $\psi(i) \subseteq \psi(j)$ or $\psi(i) \supseteq \psi(j)$. □

4 Basis Construction

In this section, we construct a basis for the logarithmic derivation module of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ when (G,ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering. In order to describe the basis, we first show the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that a vertex-weighted graph (G,ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$. Let v_k, v_i $(k < i)$ be vertices in G and m, n nonnegative integers. Then there exists a path $v_k v_{j_1} v_{j_2} \cdots v_{j_m} v_i$ between v_k and v_i such that $k < j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_m \leq \ell$ if and only if there exists a path $v_k v_{j_1} v_{j_2} \cdots v_{j_n} v_i$ between v_k and v_i such that $k < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_n < i$.*

Proof. The sufficiency is obvious. For the necessity, let $k = j_0$, $i = j_{m+1}$, and $v_{j_0} v_{j_1} v_{j_2} \cdots v_{j_m} v_{j_{m+1}}$ be a path such that $k < j_1, \ldots, j_m \leq \ell$. We prove that by induction on m. If $j_1 < \cdots < j_{m+1}$, there is nothing to prove. If not, there is an integer p $(1 \leq p \leq m)$ such that $j_p > j_{p+1}$. Let $j_q =$

$\max\{j_1, \ldots, j_p\}$, then $j_{q-1} < j_q > j_{q+1}$. Since $\{v_{j_{q-1}}, v_{j_q}\}$, $\{v_{j_q}, v_{j_{q+1}}\} \in E_G$ and v_{j_q} is simplicial in the subgraph induced by the vertices $\{v_j \mid j \le j_q\}$, we can see $\{v_{j_{q-1}}, v_{j_{q+1}}\} \in E_G$, so we obtain a path $v_{j_0} \cdots v_{j_{q-1}} v_{j_{q+1}} \cdots v_{j_{m+1}}$ and apply the induction hypothesis to it. □

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that (G, ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering $(v_1, \ldots, v_\ell)$. We may assume that $x_1, \ldots, x_\ell$ are corresponding coordinates to $v_1, \ldots, v_\ell$. Define $C_{\ge k}$ by*

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\ge k} &\coloneqq \{i \mid k < i \le \ell \text{ and there exists a path } v_k v_{j_1} v_{j_2} \cdots v_{j_m} v_i \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{such that } k < j_1, j_2, \ldots, j_m \le \ell\} \cup \{k\} \\ &= \{i \mid k < i \le \ell \text{ and there exists a path } v_k v_{j_1} v_{j_2} \cdots v_{j_n} v_i \\ &\qquad\qquad \text{such that } k < j_1 < j_2 < \cdots < j_n < i\} \cup \{k\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality follows from Lemma 4.1. Then the homogeneous derivations

$$\theta_E = \sum_{i=1} x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} + z\frac{\partial}{\partial z},$$

$$\theta_k = \sum_{i \in C_{\ge k}} \left(\prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_i) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_i - az) \right) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} \quad (1 \le k \le \ell)$$

form a basis for $D(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$, where $E_{<k} = \{j \mid 1 \le j < k,\ \{v_j, v_k\} \in E_G\}$.

Proof. First we will prove that the derivations belong to $D(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$. It is known that the Euler derivation θ_E belongs to the logarithmic derivation module of any central arrangement. Since θ_k does not contain $\frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, $\theta_k(z) = 0 \in Sz$.

Suppose $\{x_s - x_t = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$, i.e., $\{v_s, v_t\} \in E_G$ $(s < t)$. From the definition of $C_{\ge k}$, we can immediately check that $s \in C_{\ge k}$ implies $t \in C_{\ge k}$. Thus we only need to consider the cases of (i) $s, t \in C_{\ge k}$, (ii) $s \notin C_{\ge k}$ and $t \in C_{\ge k}$, and (iii) $s, t \notin C_{\ge k}$. When (i) $s, t \in C_{\ge k}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\theta_k(x_s - x_t) \\ &= \prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_s) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_s - az) - \prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_t) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_t - az) \\ &\equiv \prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_s) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_s - az) - \prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_s) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_s - az) \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (\mathrm{mod}\ x_s - x_t) \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

When (ii) $s \notin C_{\geq k}$ and $t \in C_{\geq k}$, then there is a path $v_k v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_n} v_t$ such that $k < j_1 < \cdots < j_n < t$. Since $\{v_{j_n}, v_t\}$, $\{v_s, v_t\} \in E_G$ and v_t is simplicial in the subgraph induced by the vertices $\{v_j \mid j \leq t\}$, we have $\{v_s, v_{j_n}\} \in E_G$. Continuing this process, we can see that $\{v_s, v_k\} \in E_G$, hence $s \in E_{<k}$. Thus

$$\theta_k(x_s - x_t) = -\prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_t) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_t - az) \in (x_s - x_t)S.$$

When (iii) $s, t \notin C_{\geq k}$, then $\theta_k(x_s - x_t) = 0$. Therefore $\theta_k(x_s - x_t) \in (x_s - x_t)S$ for $\{x_s - x_t = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$.

Suppose that $\{x_s - bz = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$, i.e., $b \in \psi(v_s)$. If $s \in C_{\geq k}$, then there is a path $v_k v_{j_1} \cdots v_{j_n} v_s$ such that $k < j_1 < \cdots < j_n < s$, which implies $\psi(v_k) \supseteq \psi(v_{j_1}) \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \psi(v_{j_n}) \supseteq \psi(v_s)$. Thus $b \in \psi(v_k)$, so

$$\theta_k(x_s - bz) = \prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_s) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_s - az) \in (x_s - bz)S.$$

If $s \notin C_{\geq k}$, then $\theta_k(x_s - bz) = 0$. Therefore $\theta_k(x_s - bz) \in (x_s - bz)S$ for $\{x_s - bz = 0\} \in \mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$. Consequently, $\theta_k \in D(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$ for $1 \leq k \leq \ell$. Finally, we show that $\theta_E, \theta_1, \ldots \theta_\ell$ form a basis for $D(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$. Notice that if $1 \leq i < k$, then $i \notin C_{\geq k}$, so $\theta_k(x_i) = 0$. Thus the determinant of the coefficient matrix of $\theta_E, \theta_1, \ldots \theta_\ell$ can be calculated as follows:

$$\begin{vmatrix} \theta_E(z) & \theta_1(z) & \cdots & \theta_\ell(z) \\ \theta_E(x_1) & \theta_1(x_1) & \cdots & \theta_\ell(x_1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \theta_E(x_\ell) & \theta_1(x_\ell) & \cdots & \theta_\ell(x_\ell) \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} z & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ x_1 & \theta_1(x_1) & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & 0 \\ x_\ell & \theta_1(x_\ell) & \cdots & \theta_\ell(x_\ell) \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= z \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \theta_k(x_k)$$

$$= z \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} \left(\prod_{j \in E_{<k}} (x_j - x_k) \prod_{a \in \psi(v_k)} (x_k - az) \right)$$

$$= z \prod_{v_j v_k \in E_G} (x_j - x_k) \prod_{\substack{1 \leq k \leq \ell \\ a \in \psi(v_k)}} (x_k - az)$$

$$= Q(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}).$$

Therefore it follows from Saito's criterion [8] (see also [7, Theorem 4.19]) that $\theta_E, \theta_1, \ldots \theta_\ell$ form a basis for $D(\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi})$. □

Combining the proof of Theorem 4.2 and following Ziegler's theorem, we may derive that $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is supersolvable if (G,ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering. This is another proof of the sufficiency in Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 4.3 (Ziegler [13, Theorem 6.6]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a central arrangement. Then $\mathcal{A}$ is supersolvable if and only if there is a basis for $D(\mathcal{A})$ such that the coefficient matrix of the basis is lower triangular for some choice of coordinates.*

As a corollary of Theorem 4.2, we may give the exponents of $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$, which is stated by Mu and Stanley without proof.

Corollary 4.4 (Mu-Stanley [6, Proposition 2]). *Suppose that (G,ψ) has a weighted elimination ordering $(v_1,\dots,v_\ell)$ and let $E_{<k}$ be as in Theorem 4.2. Then $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is supersolvable with exponents $\{1, |E_{<1}| + |\psi(v_1)|, \dots, |E_{<\ell}| + |\psi(v_\ell)|\}$.*

5 The proof of Theorem 1.4

We will first prove the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\ell \geq 3$ and $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ a ψ-graphical arrangement defined by the following graph (G,ψ):*



with $\psi(1) \supsetneq \psi(2) = \cdots = \psi(\ell-1) \subsetneq \psi(\ell)$.

Then $\mathcal{A}$ is not free.

The following theorem is required:

Theorem 5.2 (Orlik-Terao [7, Theorem 4.46], Terao [12]). *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be an arrangement and $H_0 \in \mathcal{A}$. Let $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}',\mathcal{A}'')$ be the triple with respect to H_0, i.e., $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{H\}, \mathcal{A}'' = \{H \cap H_0 \mid H \in \mathcal{A}'\}$. If $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ are free then $\mathcal{A}''$ is also free and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \subset \exp \mathcal{A}'$.*

Proof of Lemma 5.1. We will prove that by induction on ℓ. Suppose that $\ell = 3$. Let $H = \{x_2 - x_3 = 0\}$ and $(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A}',\mathcal{A}'')$ the triple with respect to H. Then the ordering $(1,2,3)$ is a weighted elimination ordering for $\mathcal{A}'$. Hence $\mathcal{A}'$ is supersolvable and free with the exponents $\exp(\mathcal{A}') = (1, |\psi(1)|, |\psi(2)| +$

$1, |\psi(3)|)$ by Corollary 4.4. Assume that $\mathcal{A}$ is free. Then Theorem 5.2 asserts that $\mathcal{A}''$ is also free and $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \subset \exp \mathcal{A}'$. Then $\psi(1) \subseteq \psi(3)$ or $\psi(1) \supseteq \psi(3)$ by Lemma 3.3. By Lemma 4.4, the exponents of $\mathcal{A}''$ are $(1, |\psi(1)|+1, |\psi(3)|)$ or $(1, |\psi(1)|, |\psi(3)|+1)$ respectively. In the both case, we have that $\exp \mathcal{A}'' \not\subset \exp \mathcal{A}'$. This contradiction concludes that $\mathcal{A}$ is not free.

Suppose that $\ell \geq 4$ and that the statement is true for $\ell - 1$. Let $H = \{x_{\ell-1} - x_\ell = 0\}$ and $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'')$ the triple with respect to H. Since the ordering $(1, 2, \ldots, \ell)$ is a weighted elimination ordering for $\mathcal{A}'$, the arrangement $\mathcal{A}'$ is free. If $\mathcal{A}$ is free, then $\mathcal{A}''$ is also free by Theorem 5.2. Contrary, by the induction hypothesis, we have that $\mathcal{A}''$ is not free, which is a contradiction. Hence $\mathcal{A}$ is not free. □

Proof of Theorem 1.4. By Theorem 1.3, the equivalence (1) ⇔ (2) holds. The implication (2) ⇒ (3) is well-known. Theorem 2.2 shows (1) ⇔ (4) ⇔ (5). The rest part of the proof is (3) ⇒ (4). Suppose that $\mathcal{A}_{G,\psi}$ is free. By Proposition 3.4, the graphical arrangement $\mathcal{A}_G$ is free. Therefore G is chordal by Theorem 1.2. By Lemma 3.3, Proposition 3.4 and Lemma 5.1, (G, ψ) has no induced paths in (4). Thus the proof has been completed. □

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express the deepest appreciation to Takuro Abe whose comments made enormous contribution to our work.

References

[1] T. Abe, D. Suyama, and S. Tsujie, The freeness of Ish arrangements, (2014), arXiv:1410.2084.

[2] G. A. Dirac, On rigid circuit graphs, *Abh. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg* **25** (1961), 71–76.

[3] P. H. Edelman and V. Reiner, Free hyperplane arrangements between A_{n-1} and B_n, *Math. Z.* **215** (1994), no. 3, 347–365.

[4] D. R. Fulkerson and O. A. Gross, Incidence matrices and interval graphs, *Pacific J. Math.* **15** (1965), 835–855.

[5] M. Jambu and H. Terao, Free arrangements of hyperplanes and supersolvable lattices, *Adv. in Math.* **52** (1984), no. 3, 248–258.

[6] L. Mu and R. P. Stanley, Supersolvability and freeness for ψ-graphical arrangements, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **53** (2015), no. 4, 965–970.

[7] P. Orlik and H. Terao, *Arrangements of hyperplanes*, Grundlehren der Mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 300, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1992.

[8] K. Saito, Theory of logarithmic differential forms and logarithmic vector fields, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), no. 2, 265–291.

[9] R. P. Stanley, Supersolvable lattices, *Algebra Universalis* **2** (1972), 197–217.

[10] R. P. Stanley, An introduction to hyperplane arrangements, in *Geometric combinatorics*, IAS/Park City Math. Ser., vol. 13, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2007, pp. 389–496.

[11] R. P. Stanley, Valid orderings of real hyperplane arrangements, *Discrete Comput. Geom.* **53** (2015), no. 4, 951–964.

[12] H. Terao, Arrangements of hyperplanes and their freeness. I, *J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math.* **27** (1980), no. 2, 293–312.

[13] G. M. Ziegler, Combinatorial construction of logarithmic differential forms, *Adv. Math.* **76** (1989), no. 1, 116–154.